

**Electronically Filed November 24, 2010**

<b>RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT</b>  Address to: Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Docket No.	RIGL-036CIP
	Application No.	09/293,670
	Confirmation No.	5176
	Filing Date	April 16, 1999
	Examiner	WESSENDORF, TERESA D.
	Group Art Unit	1639

Sir:

This communication is submitted in response to the Restriction Requirement dated October 27, 2010. The Examiner therein required election of one of the following species:

1. Physiological signal as recited in e.g., claim 38.
2. Exocytic inducer as recited in e.g., claim 39.
3. Type of vectors as recited in e.g., claim 37.

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute a) an exocytic inducer, b) ionomycin, and c) a retroviral vector, with traverse. As stated in the MPEP §803, if search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine the entire application on the merits, even though the entire application includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. It is the Applicants' position that it would not be unduly burdensome to perform a search on all of the claims together in the present application. Accordingly, the Applicants traverse the restriction requirement.

The Applicants expressly reserve the right under 35 USC §121 to file a divisional application directed to the non-elected subject matter or any subject matter disclosed in this application during the pendency of this application.